



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/372,416	08/11/1999	David William Roth	EWG-087	1373
7590 BEH Investments LLC 1652 48th Street Brooklyn, NY 11204			EXAMINER HUYNH, THU V	
			ART UNIT 2177	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/02/2012	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/372,416	Applicant(s) ROTH, DAVID WILLIAM	
	Examiner THU HUYNH	Art Unit 2177	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2012.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 18-84 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) 18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 19-84 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Art Unit: 2177

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 2/24/2012 to application filed on 08/11/1999 which is a continuation in part of 08/787979 priority filed on 01/22/1997
2. Claims 18-84 is pending in the case. Claims 19-84 are selected for examination.
3. The previous office action has been withdrawn as necessitated by the petition granted on 12/15/2011.

Priority

4. The applicant hereby grants priority for this application to application number 08/787,979 filed on January 22, 1997 based on the petition decision on 12/15/2011. This application has a continuation-in-part status and as such receives the January 22, 1997 priority date for only those disclosures that were already presented in the 08/787,979 application.

Terminal Disclaimer

The terminal disclaimer filed on 4/28/2009 is considered and approved. Thus, the double patenting in the previous office action has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2177

6. Claims 19-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding independent claims 19 and 52, these claims recite the limitation “the each set of bidding parameters including specification of advertising opportunities the associated advertiser desires, whereby the each set of bidding parameters indicates whether the associated advertiser is desirous that a bid should be submitted” cause the claim is unclear and also there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Dependent claims 20-51 and 53-84 are rejected for fully incorporating the dependencies of its base claim.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claims 19 and 52 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of copending Application No. 11933080 in view of Robinson, US 5918014, filed 12/26/1996. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because:

Regarding claim 19, claim 1 of the '080 teaches all limitation of claims 19-51, except the limitation of "the at least one of the plurality of sets of bidding parameters specifies a web page characteristic".

Robinson teaches bidding parameter specifies a web page characteristic (Robinson, col.4, lines 15-24, lines 64-67; advertisement is displayed to the user based on webpage's domain and content).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Robinson's teaching and the '080's teaching to includes webpage characteristic, since the combination would have provided appropriate advertisements to the users based on users' profiles as well as webpage's characteristics, wherein the appropriate advertisements "will be more likely clicked on" by the user as Robinson disclosed in col.4, lines 64-67.

Claim 52 is a computer system performing the method of claim 19. Therefore, claim 52 is obviously and similarly rejected under the same rationale.

8. Claims 20-51, 53-84 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of copending

Art Unit: 2177

Application No. 11933080 and Robinson as applied to claim 19 and 52 above and further in view of Goldhaber et al., US 5,794,210, filed 12/11/1995. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because:

Regarding claims 20-51, 53-84, Goldhaber teaches all limitation of claims 20-51, 53-84 as explained in 103 rejection bellow. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Robinson's teaching and the '080's teaching to include all features of claims 20-51, 53-84 to enhance the determining of advertisements for the users.

9. Claims 19 and 52 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of copending Application No. 11933122 in view of Robinson, US 5918014, filed 12/26/1996. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because:

Regarding claim 19, claim 1 of the '122 teaches all limitation of claims 19-51, except the limitation of "the at least one of the plurality of sets of bidding parameters specifies a web page characteristic".

Robinson teaches bidding parameter specifies a web page characteristic (Robinson, col.4, lines 15-24, lines 64-67; advertisement is displayed to the user based on webpage's domain and content).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Robinson's teaching and the '122's teaching to includes

Art Unit: 2177

webpage characteristic, since the combination would have provided appropriate advertisements to the users based on users' profiles as well as webpage's characteristics, wherein the appropriate advertisements "will be more likely clicked on" by the user as Robinson disclosed in col.4, lines 64-67.

Claim 52 is a computer system performing the method of claim 19. Therefore, claim 52 is obviously and similarly rejected under the same rationale.

10. Claims 20-51, 53-84 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of copending Application No. 11933122 and Robinson as applied to claim 19 and 52 above and further in view of Goldhaber et al., US 5,794,210, filed 12/11/1995. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because:

Regarding claims 20-51, 53-84, Goldhaber teaches all limitation of claims 20-51, 53-84 as explained in 103 rejection bellow. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Robinson's teaching and the '122's teaching to include all features of claims 20-51, 53-84 to enhance the determining of advertisements for the users.

11. Claims 19 and 52 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of copending Application No. 10655549 in view of Robinson, US 5918014, filed 12/26/1996. Although the

Art Unit: 2177

conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other

because:

Regarding claim 19, claim 1 of the '080 teaches all limitation of claims 19-51, except the limitation of "the at least one of the plurality of sets of bidding parameters specifies a web page characteristic".

Robinson teaches bidding parameter specifies a web page characteristic (Robinson, col.4, lines 15-24, lines 64-67; advertisement is displayed to the user based on webpage's domain and content).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Robinson's teaching and the '549's teaching to includes webpage characteristic, since the combination would have provided appropriate advertisements to the users based on users' profiles as well as webpage's characteristics, wherein the appropriate advertisements "will be more likely clicked on" by the user as Robinson disclosed in col.4, lines 64-67.

Claim 52 is a computer system performing the method of claim 19. Therefore, claim 52 is obviously and similarly rejected under the same rationale.

12. Claims 20-51, 53-84 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of copending Application No. 10655549 and Robinson as applied to claim 19 and 52 above and further in view of Goldhaber et al., US 5,794,210, filed 12/11/1995. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because:

Art Unit: 2177

Regarding claims 20-51, 53-84, Goldhaber teaches all limitation of claims 20-51, 53-84 as explained in 103 rejection bellow. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Robinson's teaching and the '549's teaching to include all features of claims 20-51, 53-84 to enhance the determining of advertisements for the users.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

(b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

14. Claims 19-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Goldhaber et al., US 5,794,210, filed 12/11/1995 in view of Robinson, US 5918014, filed 12/26/1996.

Regarding independent claim 19, Goldhaber discloses a method implemented in a computer system comprising of one or more networked computers, for determining in response to an advertising opportunity, which advertisement of a plurality of advertisements to provide for fulfilling the advertising opportunity, the advertising opportunity being an opportunity to serve an advertisement to a browser in response to a request for content by the browser, the method comprising:

Art Unit: 2177

- maintaining in the computer system a plurality of sets of bidding parameters, each set of bidding parameters being associated with one or more of the plurality of advertisements and an advertiser, each set of bidding parameters being associated with at least one of the plurality of advertisement and an advertiser, the each set of bidding parameters including specifications of advertising opportunities the associated advertiser desires, whereby the each set of bidding parameters indicates whether the associated advertiser is desirous that a bid should be submitted for providing one of the associated one or more of the plurality of advertisements for fulfilling the each advertising opportunity (Goldhaber , Col 4, lines 47-63; Col 7, lines 27-47; and Col 14, lines 12-46);
- receiving in the computer system an indication of the request for content, thereby presenting the each advertising opportunity (Goldhaber, Col 4, lines 47-63; Col 7, lines 27-47; and Col 14, lines 12-46);
- in response to the request for content: submitting in the computer system one or more bids, each submitted bid being based on one of the sets of bidding parameters, the one of the sets of bidding parameters being met by characteristics of the advertising opportunity, wherein the each submitted bid, in accordance with the one of the sets of bidding parameters, is associated with a monetary amount that an advertiser associated with the each submitted bid is willing to pay if the each submitted bid is selected and a specific event occurs (Goldhaber, Col 4, lines 47-63; Col 7, lines 27-47; Col 14, lines 12-46; Col 14, line 59 through Col 15, line 6; and Col 17, lines 33-63);

Art Unit: 2177

- selecting in the computer system a bid from among the submitted bids (Goldhaber, Col 4, lines 47-63); and
- serving by the computer system to the browser an advertisement associated with the selected bid, whereby the identified advertisement is determined by a bidding process (Goldhaber, Col 4, lines 47-63; Col 7, lines 27-47; Col 14, lines 12-46; Col 14, line 59 through Col 15, line 6; and Col 17, lines 33-63).

However, Goldhaber does not teach at least one of the pluralities of sets of bidding parameters specifies a web page characteristic.

Robinson teaches bidding parameter specifies a web page characteristic (Robinson, col.4, lines 15-24, lines 64-67; advertisement is displayed to the user based on webpage's domain and content).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Robinson's teaching and Goldhaber's teaching to includes webpage characteristic, since the combination would have provided appropriate advertisements to the users based on users' profiles as well as webpage's characteristics, wherein the appropriate advertisements "will be more likely clicked on" by the user as Robinson disclosed in col.4, lines 64-67.

Regarding claim 20, Goldhaber teaches the monetary amount associated with each of the submitted bids is included in the each of the submitted bids (Goldhaber, Col 4, lines 47-63; Col 7, lines 27-47; Col 14, lines 12-46; Col 14, line 59 through Col 15, line 6; and Col 17, lines 33-63)

Regarding claim 21, Goldhaber teaches the specific event for which the advertiser associated with each of the determined bids is willing to pay the monetary amount associated with the each of the submitted bids, is a same respective event for all of the submitted and determined bids (Goldhaber, Col 4, lines 47-63; Col 7, lines 27-47; and Col 14, lines 12-46).

Regarding claim 22, Goldhaber teaches the specific event for which the advertiser associated with at least one of the submitted bids is willing to pay the monetary amount associated with the at least one of the submitted bids, is a serving of an advertisement associated with the at least one of the submitted bids to the browser in fulfillment of the each advertising opportunity (Goldhaber, Col 4, lines 47-63; Col 7, lines 27-47; Col 14, lines 12-46; Col 14, line 59 through Col 15, line 6; and Col 17, lines 33-63).

Regarding claim 23, Goldhaber teaches the specific event for which the advertiser associated with at least one determined bid is willing to pay the monetary amount associated with the at least one submitted and determined bid is a serving of an advertisement associated with the at least one submitted and determined bid to the browser in fulfillment of the each advertising opportunity (Goldhaber, Col 4, lines 47-63; Col 7, lines 27-47; Col 14, lines 12-46; Col 14, line 59 through Col 15, line 6; and Col 17, lines 33-63).

Art Unit: 2177

Regarding claims 24-28, Goldhaber teaches the request for content by the browser is caused by a reference in the web page (Goldhaber, Col 4, lines 47-63; Col 7, lines 27-47; Col 14, lines 12-46; Col 14, line 59 through Col 15, line 6; and Col 17, lines 33-63)

Regarding claim 29, Goldhaber teaches each submitted bid is associated with a respective bidding agent (Goldhaber, Col 4, lines 47-63; Col 7, lines 27-47; Col 14, lines 12-46; Col 14, line 59 through Col 15, line 6; and Col 17, lines 33-63)

Regarding claim 30, Goldhaber teaches each submitted bid includes a reference to an advertisement associated with the each submitted bid (Goldhaber, Col 4, lines 47-63; Col 7, lines 27-47; Col 14, lines 12-46; Col 14, line 59 through Col 15, line 6; and Col 17, lines 33-63)

Regarding claim 31, Goldhaber teaches information about a viewer utilizing the browser is maintained in the computer system (Goldhaber, Col 14, line 59 through Col 15, line 6).

Regarding claim 32, Goldhaber teaches the selection of the selected bid is based on the selected bid being determined in a computer system through an auction process and including advertisement relevance or targeting criteria (Col 4, lines 47-63; Col 7, lines 27-47; Col 14, lines 12-46; Col 14, line 59 through Col 15, line 6; and Col 17, lines 33-63). While Goldhaber does not explicitly state the winning bid is associated with highest beneficial value over respective beneficial values of other submitted bids, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select the highest beneficial for the given targeting

Art Unit: 2177

parameters as the winning bid in the auction process. The rationale for selecting the highest beneficial value, is that there are a limited number of predictable processes used to select the winner of an auction process and one such predictable process is the selection of the bid that has the highest beneficial value.

Regarding claim 33, Goldhaber teaches the monetary amount associated with each of the submitted bids is included in the each of the submitted bids (Goldhaber, Col 4, lines 47-63; Col 7, lines 27-47; Col 14, lines 12-46; Col 14, line 59 through Col 15, line 6; and Col 17, lines 33-63)

Regarding claim 34, Goldhaber teaches the specific event for which the advertiser associated with each of the submitted bids is willing to pay the monetary amount associated with the each of the submitted bids, is a same respective event for all of the submitted bids (Goldhaber, Col 4, lines 47-63; Col 7, lines 27-47; and Col 14, lines 12-46)

Regarding claim 35, Goldhaber teaches the specific event for which the advertiser associated with at least one of the submitted bids is willing to pay the monetary amount associated with the at least one of the submitted bids, is a serving of an advertisement associated with the at least one of the submitted bids to the browser in fulfillment of the advertising opportunity (Goldhaber, Col 4, lines 47-63; Col 7, lines 27-47; Col 14, lines 12-46; Col 14, line 59 through Col 15, line 6; and Col 17, lines 33-63).

Art Unit: 2177

Regarding claim 36, Goldhaber teaches the specific event for which the advertiser associated with each of the submitted bids is willing to pay the monetary amount associated with the each of the submitted bids, is a serving of an advertisement associated with the each of the submitted bids to the browser in fulfillment of the advertising opportunity (Goldhaber, Col 4, lines 47-63; Col 7, lines 27-47; Col 14, lines 12-46; Col 14, line 59 through Col 15, line 6; and Col 17, lines 33-63).

Regarding claims 37-41, which are dependent on claims 32-36, Goldhaber teaches the request for content by the browser is caused by a reference in a web page (Goldhaber, Col 4, lines 47-63; Col 7, lines 27-47; Col 14, lines 12-46; Col 14, line 59 through Col 15, line 6; and Col 17, lines 33-63).

Regarding claim 42, Goldhaber teaches Goldhaber discloses the method of claims 67-81, 119-133, 171-185, 218, and 219 respectively, wherein the selection of the selected bid is based on the selected bid being associated with an auction process. (Col 4, lines 47-63; Col 7, lines 27-47; Col 14, lines 12-46; Col 14, line 59 through Col 15, line 6; and Col 17, lines 33-63). While Goldhaber does not explicitly state the winning bid is associated with highest monetary amount, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select the highest bid for the given targeting parameters as the winning bid in the auction process. The rationale for selecting the highest bid, is that there are a limited number of predictable processes used to select the winner of an auction process and one such predictable process is the selection of the highest bidder as the winner

Regarding claim 43, Goldhaber teaches the monetary amount associated with each of the submitted bids is included in the each of the submitted bids (Goldhaber, Col 4, lines 47-63; Col 7, lines 27-47; Col 14, lines 12-46; Col 14, line 59 through Col 15, line 6; and Col 17, lines 33-63).

Regarding claim 44, Goldhaber teaches the specific event for which the advertiser associated with each of the submitted bids is willing to pay the monetary amount associated with the each of the submitted bids, is a same respective event for all of the submitted bids (Goldhaber, Col 4, lines 47-63; Col 7, lines 27-47; and Col 14, lines 12-46).

Regarding claim 45, Goldhaber teaches the specific event for which the advertiser associated with at least one of the submitted bids is willing to pay the monetary amount associated with the at least one of the submitted bids, is a serving of an advertisement associated with the at least one of the submitted bids to the browser in fulfillment of the advertising opportunity (Goldhaber, Col 4, lines 47-63; Col 7, lines 27-47; Col 14, lines 12-46; Col 14, line 59 through Col 15, line 6; and Col 17, lines 33-63).

Regarding claim 46, Goldhaber teaches the specific event for which the advertiser associated with each of the submitted bids is willing to pay the monetary amount associated with the each of the submitted bids, is a serving of an advertisement associated with the each of the submitted bids to the browser in fulfillment of the advertising opportunity (Goldhaber, Col 4,

Art Unit: 2177

lines 47-63; Col 7, lines 27-47; Col 14, lines 12-46; Col 14, line 59 through Col 15, line 6; and Col 17, lines 33-63).

Regarding claims 47-51, which are dependent on claims 42-46, Goldhaber teaches the request for content by the browser is caused by a reference in a web page (Goldhaber, Col 4, lines 47-63; Col 7, lines 27-47; Col 14, lines 12-46; Col 14, line 59 through Col 15, line 6; and Col 17, lines 33-63).

Claims 52-84 are for computer system performing the methods of claims 19-51 respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 19-84 have been considered but are moot because the arguments do not apply to any of the references being used in the current rejection.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record, listed on PTO 892 provided to Applicant is considered to have relevancy to the claimed invention.

Applicant should review each identified reference carefully before responding to this office action to properly advance the case in light of the prior art.

Art Unit: 2177

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THU HUYNH whose telephone number is (571)272-4126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cesar B. Paula can be reached on (571) 272-4128. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Thu Huynh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2177
March 2012